ID.date Date of interview
22/01/20

ID.start Time interview started
09:28:03

ID.endDate Completion date of interview
22/01/20

ID.end Time interview ended
09:38:39

ID.time Duration of interview
10.60

Start of new case

Q1 Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don’t know, what other issues would you like to be covered in it?

Q2 Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?

Q3 Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don’t know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.

Examples of structured and unstructured data Examples of when supplementary information should be included alongside a disclosure (most request are specific and the purpose of processing the data is obvious)

Q4 We have found that data protection professionals often struggle with applying and defining 'manifestly unfounded or excessive' subject access requests. We would like to include a wide range of examples from a variety of sectors to help you. Please provide some examples of manifestly unfounded and excessive requests below (if applicable).

This is difficult as the guidance includes definitions of 'excessive' as overlapping or repeating the substances of previous or other requests and 'manifestly unfounded' as targeting an employee with a grudge. However many requests are the result of an on-going unresolved service complaint and are often used to undermine the complaint investigation by tryng to 'prove a point'. It's unclear whether or not a refusal (on either grounds) could be justified particularly where a service area has rigorously investgiated and offered to provide documentation and/or meet the complainant to discuss.

Q5 On a scale of 1-5 how useful is the draft guidance?

1 - Not at all useful	2 – Slightly useful	3 – Moderately useful	4 – Very useful	5 – Extremely useful
○	○	○	☑	○

Q6 Why have you given this score?

Most issues covered

Q7 To what extent do you agree that the draft guidance is clear and easy to understand?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	☑	○

Q8 Please provide any further comments or suggestions you may have about the draft guidance.

Guidance re: deceased persons, whose data/information is not covered by GDPR or FOI legislation

Q9 Are you answering as:

- ( ) An individual acting in a private capacity (eg someone providing their views as a member of the public)
- ( ) An individual acting in a professional capacity
- (✓) On behalf of an organisation
- ( ) Other

Please specify the name of your organisation:

milton keynes council

What sector are you from:

local government/authority

Q10 How did you find out about this survey?

- ( ) ICO Twitter account
- ( ) ICO Facebook account
- ( ) ICO LinkedIn account
- ( ) ICO website
- ( ) ICO newsletter
- ( ) ICO staff member
- ( ) Colleague
- ( ) Personal/work Twitter account
- ( ) Personal/work Facebook account
- ( ) Personal/work LinkedIn account
- ( ) Other

If other please specify: